



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## STUDIES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY M. H. SEGAL, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

### II

#### THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.<sup>2</sup>

THERE is a general agreement among critics on the question of the literary character of the work which we are studying in these papers. Some forty years ago, Julius Wellhausen laid it down as a principle that the so-called 'documentary hypothesis' of Pentateuchal criticism must be applied also to our book. His followers and disciples have obeyed loyally, one may almost say piously, the precept of the Master. They have accepted the 'documentary hypothesis' as a firmly established truth and have repeated, in a more or less extended form, the arguments and proofs advanced by the Master, without pausing to inquire into their soundness or adequacy. But in spite of this unanimity and assurance of the critics, the present writer thought it necessary to undertake a fresh examination with a free and open mind of the whole question of the Composition of our book. After a painstaking inquiry into the subject, he has arrived at the conclusion that the arguments of the critics are unsound, their proofs inconclusive, and their general hypothesis unreasonable and improbable. He has found that the undoubtedly difficult problems of the com-

<sup>2</sup> For convenience sake, and in accordance with Hebrew tradition, we shall throughout these papers speak of the two books of Samuel as one book.

position of our book can be solved by another hypothesis which he feels will prove more rational in itself, and in greater accordance with the facts presented by our book than the hypothesis of the critics.

In the following pages we propose first to discuss the general character of the hypothesis of the critics and its application to those sections of our book from which it is said to derive its main support. We shall then show that it fails to solve the problems of these sections, and we shall submit an alternative and, to our mind, a more satisfactory solution. Finally, we shall undertake a detailed examination in the light of our own theory of the whole book, and discuss in particular those sections and passages, the integrity of which has been either questioned or altogether denied by the critics.

1. The 'documentary hypothesis' of the critics, which we prefer to call the 'redactional hypothesis', may be briefly summarized as follows: Our book is not the work of an author, or authors, who narrated in their own or in borrowed language the events contained therein. It is rather the work of one or more redactors who pieced together excerpts from various documents, differing in age, in point of view, and in reliability, and often mutually overlapping and contradictory. These redactors dealt freely with their material, altering, omitting, and supplementing according as it suited their purpose or their religious views. They often tried, more or less skilfully, to hide or gloze over the inconsistencies between the various excerpts, but often, again, they allowed these inconsistencies to remain.

2. Now, such a hypothesis in the case of a book which bears on the face of it a fairly homogeneous character requires conclusive and irrefutable evidence for its justifi-

cation. A work like the Books of Samuel, which displays a certain unity of plan and unity of purpose, must *prima facie* be credited also with unity of authorship, unless there are very strong proofs to the contrary. The critics assert that they can produce such proofs. They maintain that our book contains sections which contradict and overlap each other, which display divergent and inconsistent points of view, and cannot, therefore, have emanated from one and the same author. It may, however, be asked: if one author could not have written these mutually contradictory or mutually exclusive passages, how could one and the same redactor have combined them in one and the same work? The redactor evidently regarded these passages as supplementing or complementing one another. How could he have failed to overlook their inconsistencies and divergencies? He was not incompetent or devoid of the critical faculty. This is amply proved by the great skill with which he manipulated his material, so that he has only been found out during the last forty years, and then only after the application of an intricate and laborious process of reasoning by some of the most brilliant intellects of latter-day Germany. Was he then a deliberate impostor or a dishonest jester? The critics sometimes credit their redactors with all sorts of extravagances, but as a rule they recognize the redactor's sincerity and *bona fides*. The fact, therefore, that competent and honest redactors combined these passages must tend to prove that the alleged inconsistencies of the passages cannot after all be of so serious and striking a character as the critics maintain. But what is true of a redactor dealing with a mass of excerpts from written documents may also be true to an equal degree of an original writer dealing with a mass of

tradition, oral or written, derived from different quarters and different generations. We must remember that our book is not a scientific treatise on logic, or an artistic work of the imagination. It is only a history compiled from oral or written traditions which must have passed through many mouths and many hands before they found their place in our book. We have, therefore, no right to demand of our book a perfect freedom from any particular inconsistencies, irrelevances, or even contradictions in minor details. All that we can expect from it is a certain homogeneity of material, and a *general* consistency in the presentation of events and in the characters of its heroes. Our book does offer us such a homogeneity and such a general consistency. And if it is admitted that the discrepancies displayed by our book could have been passed unchecked by a compiler of written excerpts, why not admit likewise that they could have been passed also by a compiler of oral traditions? Why deny to an author the latitude allowed to a redactor?

However, this argument may be dismissed by the adherents of the 'redactional hypothesis' as of too general, too vague, and subjective a character. We therefore proceed to discuss in detail the composition of the two crucial sections of our book, on which the critics base their hypothesis, viz. the story of the election of Saul to the throne of Israel (1 Sam. chs. 8-12) and the story of the introduction of David to Saul's court (1 Sam. chs. 16-18).

#### THE ELECTION OF SAUL.

3. The account of the election of Saul contained in 1 Sam. chs. 8-12 is separated by the critics into two independent documents, viz. (i) chs. 8; 10. 17-25 a; 12,

and (ii) chs. 9-10. 16; 11. 1-11, 15. The first document we shall call, with Budde and others, E, and the second J. In E Samuel is represented as the supreme theocratic ruler of Israel. Having grown too old to rule the people by himself, he appoints his two sons as judges. The sons prove to be unworthy of their high office, and the people come to Samuel and demand that he should appoint a king over them. Samuel is displeased with this demand, and his displeasure is shared by God Himself. He receives the divine command to warn the people that the kingship would prove an oppressive burden upon them. The people, however, remain obdurate, and Samuel is finally commanded by God to give way to them, and appoint them a king (8. 1-22 a). Thereupon Samuel calls an assembly at Mizpah, where he rebukes the people in God's name for rejecting God as their king, and for demanding a human king as their ruler. He then casts lots, and Saul is elected king over Israel. When Saul is brought into the midst of the assembly, both Samuel and the people acclaim him as the chosen one of the Lord (10. 17-25 a). Samuel then formally resigns his rule in a solemn farewell address (ch. 12).

In J, on the other hand, which is the older account, Saul visits Samuel to inquire for the lost asses of his father. The prophet, however, had already on the previous day been informed by God of Saul's coming, and had been commanded to anoint him as king that he might save Israel from the Philistine oppression. Saul is cordially received by the prophet, and invited by him to partake of his hospitality, and is also immediately informed of the greatness that awaits him. On the following morning he is secretly anointed by the prophet, and is given three

signs, on the fulfilment of which he is bidden to undertake whatever opportunity affords him, as God would be with him. The three signs are duly fulfilled, but on his return home Saul does not divulge his anointment to his friends (chs. 9-10. 17). About a month later<sup>3</sup> messengers from Jabesh Gilead arrive in Gibeah seeking aid against the Ammonites. Saul returns from the field behind his oxen, and on hearing the story of the messengers, he is seized with the spirit of God, and issues a summons to all Israel to follow him against the Ammonites. A mighty host responds to his call; he marches against the Ammonites, inflicts on them a great defeat, and rescues Jabesh Gilead (10. 27 b-11. 11). Then the people march to Gilgal, and there appoint him king over Israel (11. 15).

4. These two accounts are, according to most recent critics, complete in themselves, and independent of one another.<sup>4</sup> The redactor, however, combined them into one story by cutting them into portions, thus: E (8. 1-22 a), J (9-10. 16), E (10. 17-25 a), J (10. 27 b-11. 11, 15), and again E (ch. 12). These various pieces he joined together by means of links of his own. Thus, the first two pieces are linked together by the redactional addition in 8. 22 b. This addition thus serves to sever the first part of E (ch. 8) from the second (10. 17 ff.), and also to prepare for J in ch. 9. The third and fourth pieces are linked together by the redactional addition in 10. 25 b-27 a. This addition, besides severing the second portion of E (10. 17-25 a) from

<sup>3</sup> Cf. LXX and Driver's note *ad loc.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. especially K. Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, 172. The older critics generally hold that the writer of the first account knew the second account (9-10. 16), and deliberately altered it to suit his purpose. So Wellhausen (*Composition d. Hexateuchs*<sup>3</sup>, 241), Kuenen, and Stade.

the third (ch. 12), also serves to brush away the inconsistency between 10. 17-25 a and the second portion of J (ch. 11). For, if Saul had already been acclaimed by all Israel as their king, how is it that he appears in 11. 5 as a private individual? The redactor replies that although Saul was recognized by all Israel, yet 'the worthless' rejected his kingship, and owing to this opposition he had to retire into private life. This redactional fiction has as its sequel another addition, as fictitious as its antecedent, in 11. 12-13. Further, the redactor had to find room for Samuel in the important events related in ch. 11. And so he inserted in 11. 7 the two words *אחר שמואל*, and the whole of ver. 14, where he makes Samuel summon the people to Gilgal in order to '*renew* the kingdom', i. e. to reconfirm the election of 10. 17 ff.

5. It will be seen from this analysis that the redactor has manipulated his material with astonishing skill and adroitness. His cleverness in cutting up his original documents and piecing them together in new combinations, his critical acuteness in discovering an inconsistency and getting rid of it, are really admirable, and are only surpassed by the cleverness and subtlety of our modern German critics, who have shown up so skilfully all the redactor's literary artifices. However, to people of a simple straightforward mind the whole redactional process described by the critics must appear complicated, artificial, and altogether improbable. It is too ingenious to be true. We have no evidence that the simple and childlike mind of the ancient Hebrew was capable of such subtle, such highly developed literary criticism, as is involved in this redactional process. Further, there is nothing in the style or diction, or in the thought of the passages described



by the critics as redactional additions, to distinguish or differentiate them in any way from their context. They are declared spurious not because there is anything suspicious about them, but only because they do not suit the hypothesis of the critics. These objections may, however, be dismissed by the critics as purely subjective. We will, therefore, endeavour in what follows to submit the analysis of the critics to a strictly objective examination.

6. The critics assert that our section consists of a combination of two originally complete and independent accounts. But a little examination will show that these accounts are neither complete nor independent of each other. In E (8; 10. 17-25 a; 12) Saul is elected by the sacred lot. There is no mention in E of an anointment of Saul by the prophet. Why, then, does Samuel proceed in the same document, and immediately after the election by lot, to call Saul 'the Lord's anointed' (12. 3, 5)? Why does the prophet say in a passage belonging according to the critics to the same document E, or at least to the same stratum: 'The Lord sent me to anoint thee king over Israel' (15. 1, 17; cf. also 24. 7; 26. 9, &c.)? The references are evidently to 10. 1, i.e. to the so-called J document, thus showing dependence of E on J. The critics try to escape from this difficulty in their usual fashion, namely by fastening the blame on the redactor. E also contained, they assert, a statement of Saul's anointment by Samuel, only the redactor omitted it in favour of the statement in J (cf. Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, 172; Stenning in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. 385 b, foot-note). Plain unbiassed people will, however, prefer to explain these references in the most obvious and most reasonable way, viz. as based on the statement in 10. 1.

7. Again, E has no reference whatever to an acquaintance between Saul and Samuel until after the former's election by the lot. Before the lot was cast neither the people, nor Samuel, nor Saul had any inkling whatever as to who was going to be elected. The result of the lot before its declaration was a complete mystery to all concerned. What, then, prompted Saul to hide himself away from the assembly at Mizpah (10. 22)? It cannot be that he slipped out after his name had been mentioned. For the text says explicitly that Samuel ordered the people to stand according to their tribes and clans; that after the tribe of Benjamin had been 'taken', he brought forward that tribe family by family, and then the family of Matri man by man, when Saul was 'taken' (10. 19b-21; cf. LXX; so Kimḥi and Joseph Kaspi, *Adné Keseph*, ed. I. Last, i. 16). Saul must have been present during the latter process, for he had no reason, any more than anybody else, to suspect that he would be the chosen one. His slipping away after his name had been called out would certainly have attracted the greatest possible attention. At any rate, his presence before would have been noticed by his clansmen, or at least by the members of his own family. The inquiry made of the oracle הַבַּיִת הַלֵּל הָאֵל (10. 22, LXX, cf. Driver's note) is thus rendered absurd and impossible. The only explanation of the incident that is at all reasonable is that Saul had left the assembly before the lots were cast, and before the people were arranged according to tribes, and the tribes according to clans and families; and that Saul knew beforehand that he would be the chosen one of the lot, having already been previously designated for the high office, as described in 10. 1 f.

8. Further, according to the analysis of the critics, ch. 12 is the direct continuation of 10. 25 a, and the address contained therein was the farewell address delivered by the prophet immediately after the declaration of the lot. But how could Samuel say at that moment *הנה המלך מתהלך לפניכם* {12. 2)? Such words could only have been spoken after Saul had proved himself a capable leader of the people, as is related in ch. 11. Thus ch. 12 is acquainted with ch. 11 and dependent upon it.

9. Again, according to the analysis of the critics, E represents Saul as securing the throne by the mere fact of having been elected thereto by the lot. The all-powerful prophet immediately transferred to him the sovereignty which he had wielded over the people; and the whole nation meekly submitted to the rule of an inexperienced, untried young man without murmur or misgiving. Is this possible? Would even a credulous writer have believed such an improbable story? We know that the people remained loyal to Saul to the very end. His reign was never marred by any rising or rebellion, such as troubled the reign of the greater and more successful ruler who followed him. And so great was the people's attachment to the person of Saul that after his death they preferred the rule of his weak son to that of the brave and clever David, their old favourite. Is it not natural to expect that some disaffection would have displayed itself, at least at the outset of his reign, a disaffection which could only have been suppressed by some exceptional achievement on the part of the young king, combined with the overpowering influence of the great prophet, his friend and supporter, who rallied round him the whole people, and secured their permanent and unshaken devotion to the new ruler? In

other words, are not 10. 27 and the whole of ch. 11, including vers. 14-15, the logical and indispensable sequel to 10. 17 ff.?

10. Finally, the critics tell us that the election of Saul took place in Mizpah according to E, and in Gilgal according to J. E knows nothing of Gilgal in connexion with Saul's election. If so, it is strange that both in 13. 8 ff. (J according to the critics) and in ch. 15 (E according to the critics), Samuel and Saul are taken out of their way and brought to Gilgal for the sentence of rejection on Saul. The fact that E, too, places the rejection of Saul at Gilgal shows that E also knew of the connexion of Gilgal with Saul's election, as described in 11. 14-15.

Thus, these considerations prove conclusively that E is incomplete, and that it is dependent on J.

11. But neither is J complete in itself.

For according to the analysis of the critics, J is ignorant of an agitation among the people for the appointment of a king. God Himself took the initiative and offered the people through His prophet a king who would save Israel from the Philistines. If so, Saul, when he came to Samuel in ch. 9, could, like anybody else in Israel, have had no knowledge whatever of the prophet's intention with regard to himself, or of the whole plan of establishing a monarchy in Israel. How was it, then, that he at once took in the meaning of Samuel's otherwise cryptic remark: *ולמי כל* (9. 20 b)? His answer in the following verse proves conclusively that he knew well that Samuel was looking out for a suitable occupant of the throne of Israel.

Again, why did Saul's uncle, on hearing that Saul had visited Samuel, ask with such eagerness, *הגידה נא לי וגו'* (10. 15)? How can one explain this eagerness in the

sayings of a person who, according to the critics' interpretation of J, was but an obscure village seer and clairvoyant? Evidently Saul's uncle had a higher opinion of Samuel's importance than the critics; and he was aware of the fact that Samuel was looking out for a suitable young man to occupy the throne of Israel, as related in 8. 22.

12. Further, how after all is one to explain the authoritative action of Saul in peremptorily ordering all Israel to muster together for the battle against the Ammonites, and the unanimous response of all the people (11. 7)? Barak, Gideon, and Jephthah (Judges 5. 14 ff.; 6. 35; 12. 2-3) had to beg the people, and not quite successfully, to rally round them in order to expel the invader. But this obscure, shy young Benjamite simply issues a *fiat*, threatens disobedience with heavy punishment, and all Israel take fright, and meekly obey the orders of an unknown, inexperienced young man. The only explanation possible is that Saul was then no longer an obscure private individual, but the king elect of Israel, as described in 10. 17 ff., but that, for reasons which we shall mention later, he had not yet assumed the actual office of king.

13. Finally, if the people had not been clamouring previously for the appointment of a king, it is exceedingly strange that by a sudden impulse and without any previous deliberation as to the need and desirability of a king, or the fitness of Saul for the kingly office, the people, hitherto so clannish and so jealous for their tribal independence, should have proceeded straight from the battlefield of Jabesh Gilead to the sanctuary of Gilgal, and there and then without any preparation whatever elected Saul as their king! Even the writer of J must have known that the people's resolve to change their old patriarchal

constitution into that of a monarchy could not have been taken so suddenly and instantaneously, particularly as the people were living under Philistine overlordship. Was there none circumspect enough in the whole host of Israel to counsel caution, and warn the people that their rashness would incense the Philistines and bring down upon them the oppressors' dire vengeance? And it is more remarkable that standing alone without the support of so powerful a personality as the Samuel of E, and without the *prestige* lent to his appointment by the decree of the sacred lot, Saul should have met with no opposition whatever on the part of any portion of his own people, of whom so many were lukewarm and even faithless to the national cause, as is proved by the large numbers who had definitely gone over to the Philistine side (14. 12). Thus we are confronted in J with the same difficulty which met us in E (cf. above, § 9), viz. how did Saul succeed in securing at the very outset of his reign, and in holding right to the end, the unanimous support and attachment of Israel?

14. It is evident from what we have said above that taking all the facts into consideration the only rational and logical account of the appointment and the accession of Saul is something similar to the account presented to us in our present text, which is somewhat as follows: The people had, for one reason or another, decided to organize themselves into a monarchy. They applied to Samuel, the leading personality of the day, to find them a suitable occupant of the high office of king; Samuel's choice fell upon Saul, whom he first appointed privately, and afterwards publicly by the sacred lot cast in the presence of the whole people. Some persons, however, expressed dissatisfaction with Samuel's choice, perhaps for some private

reasons, or because they had another candidate in view. Owing to certain causes, such as the fear of the Philistines and the disaffection fomented by his opponents, Saul did not immediately assume office. When the appeal for help came from Jabesh Gilead, he issued on his own authority as king elect, combined with the authority of Samuel,<sup>5</sup> an urgent summons for a general military levy, to which the people responded in a remarkably unanimous fashion. His magnificent victory over the Ammonites greatly impressed the people, convinced them of his fitness for the kingship, and silenced for ever his opponents and detractors. Then the people, with Samuel at their head, marched to Gilgal, and solemnly ratified of their own free will the choice of Saul as king, previously made by the sacred lot independently of their consent, after which Samuel delivered an impressive address to both king and people.

15. What, then, has forced the critics to cut up our section into a number of pieces and to assign them to two distinct documents? The critics answer that their analysis has been forced upon them by the irreconcilable discrepancies revealed in the various parts of our section. We may summarize the evidence for the critics' analysis under the following three headings:

(i) *Origin of the Monarchy.* In J Israel suffers from the Philistine oppression, and cries to God for deliverance. In response to this cry God commands Samuel to anoint

<sup>5</sup> 11. 7: **וַאֲחֵר יִמְוָאֵל**. The critics, however, audaciously declare these two words to be a redactional interpolation, but for no other reason except that the two words clash with their hypothesis; cf. above, § 4. This is a characteristic example of the 'critical' method. There is no need to defend the originality of the words, but we may add that a late interpolator would certainly have placed Samuel before Saul.

Saul, who would save the people from the Philistines (10. 16). In E, on the other hand, the external condition of Israel is entirely favourable. The people demand a king, because they want to be like the heathen nations. Their demand is treated by God and by His prophet as an act of wanton rebellion, and is only acceded to reluctantly.

(ii) *Character of Samuel and his part in Saul's election.*

In J Samuel is a village seer, a mere clairvoyant who for a consideration gives information concerning lost property. His activity is confined to his own little district, and his very existence is unknown to Saul, who lives but a few miles away from Ramah. Samuel is employed by God for one purpose only, the anointment of Saul. After this act he retires from the scene, and leaves everything to the workings of the Divine spirit in Saul. In E Samuel is the Judge of Israel, who rules over the people as God's representative. In this capacity he elects a king for the people, and solemnly hands over to him the reins of government.

(iii) *Saul's position after his election by the lot.* The messengers of Jabesh Gilead are sent out to 'all the border of Israel' (11. 3) and come to Gibeah just as they came to other places. Saul is represented as a private man following the ploughing oxen. He is only informed of the embassy from Jabesh Gilead after he has inquired for the cause of the people's weeping. This is inconsistent with the position ascribed to him in 10. 17 ff. as the duly elected king of Israel. The men of valour who accompany Saul in 10. 26 do not appear in ch. 11. 'The sons of worthlessness who by their action prevent him from assuming the kingly office, are apparently so few in number that



they can be threatened with death in 11. 12-13; yet it is presumably on their account that the election of Saul requires confirmation.<sup>6</sup>

16. Of these three arguments only the first has any force. The second and third are based on a mistaken interpretation of our text. The critics try to make out that Samuel is represented in our book in varying and not quite consistent characters: as a prophet, as a judge of the type found in the Book of Judges,<sup>7</sup> and finally as a mere village seer. This is an error. Samuel is represented throughout our book in one character only, viz. that of a great prophet who revived and purified the religious sentiments of the people, thereby creating greater cohesion among the tribes, and finally welding them together into a nation and placing it under the rule of a king. His activities were manifold and varying according to the needs of the circumstances. But he is always the Prophet and Religious Teacher. The same position he occupies in 9-10. 16. There is not a single word in this portion to show that the name and character of Samuel were unknown to Saul. On the contrary, Samuel is introduced in 9. 14 as a well-known personality, requiring no further description than the mere mention of his name. The details given by the maidens in ver. 13, his actions and words at the sanctuary, all stamp him as a great personality, occupying a pre-eminent position among his people. Note also his familiar and intimate relation with the Deity as revealed in the expressions 'וה' ענינו (9. 15), 'וה' גלה את און ש' (ver. 17).

<sup>6</sup> Stenning, *op. cit.*, 386 a; cf. Budde, *op. cit.*, 172 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Ch. 7. But as a matter of fact, Samuel confined himself to praying and sacrificing, and, in contrast to the *Shofetim*, took no part in the actual fighting.

Further, the maidens' statement *כִּי הָיִים בָּא לְעִיר* (ver. 12) seems to indicate that the prophet was frequently away from his home for protracted periods. The reference can only be to his judicial circuits described in 7. 16–17. The importance of Samuel in the eyes of his contemporaries is also confirmed by the conversation of Saul with his uncle (10. 14–16). Saul does not say 'We came to a certain seer called Samuel', but simply 'We came to Samuel', as a well-known personality. On hearing this the uncle asks eagerly: 'Do tell me, I pray thee, what did Samuel say unto you?' He would surely not have displayed such eagerness about the sayings of Samuel if the latter had been merely an obscure village seer unknown in Gibeah. The critics have been misled in their interpretation of Samuel's character by the words of Saul's servant in 9. 6. These words, spoken probably by a lad, have been taken by the critics as a full and exact description of Samuel and his position in contemporary Israel. They really represent nothing more than the conception of Samuel in the minds of the ignorant lower classes of the people, to whom the prophet was most remarkable for his skill in revealing hidden things. That Saul should wish to present the prophet with some gift (not a *reward*) need not cause any surprise. The presentation of gifts by visitors was the usual mark of respect accorded both to kings (1 Sam. 10. 4, 27, &c.) and to prophets (2 Kings 4. 42; 5. 15, &c.). It must be admitted that the figure of Samuel does not loom so very large in ch. 9 ff. as in other portions of our book; but that is due to the fact that the narrator's interest is centred in Saul. For the moment the future king is the hero, and all others must as much as possible recede into the background. The narrative in 9–10. 16 is not a dry and

precise history, but an historical romance written with great charm and skill by a writer of certain pronounced literary peculiarities. He gives greater prominence to Saul, in order to bring out his figure into marked relief. He hides for a time the identity of the seer, and then reveals his name suddenly (9. 14). The name of the seer's city he withholds altogether, though there is no doubt whatever that it was Ramah.<sup>8</sup>

17. As for the third argument, it is true that in ch. 11 Saul does not appear as invested with full royal powers. But, as we hinted above (§ 14), there were two good reasons why Saul did not form a royal court immediately after his election by the lot; first, because of the genuine fear that the Philistine masters of the land would at once proceed to attack him before he had had time to raise an army of defence; and secondly, as the narrative indicates, because he had first to overcome the opposition to his election. The 'sons of worthlessness' were indeed few, but their number was sufficiently strong to foment dissatisfaction, and eventually to organize a formidable opposition. Further, there is no warrant for interpreting 10. 26 a to mean that Saul formed a bodyguard of the 'men of valour'. Such an interpretation is particularly unfortunate from the point of view of the critics themselves, who hold that ver. 26 is part of a redactional addition. For in view of the appearance of Saul in ch. 11 as a private man, the redactor would be stultifying himself by asserting that Saul had immediately surrounded himself with a royal bodyguard. The fact is that *וילכו עמו* means no more than 'they

<sup>8</sup> Budde (*op. cit.*, 171) holds that because the name of the seer's city is not given, therefore according to J Samuel did not reside in Ramah. But can this critic tell us where else Samuel resided?

accompanied him on his way'. Had the writer meant to say that they remained with him permanently, he would have said *ויהיו עמו*, as in 13. 2, or *וילכו אחריו* as in Judges 9. 4. Since, therefore, Saul found it necessary to return for a time to private life, it is not surprising that the people of Jabesh Gilead should not have mentioned Saul's name to the Ammonite king, and that they should have felt it necessary to implore for help in all parts of Israel. Nor is it surprising that Saul should have resumed for a time his former labours in the field. On the other hand, as we have already noted above (§ 12), the authoritative self-assertion of Saul and the remarkable response of the people (11. 7) can be satisfactorily explained only by the fact that the people knew him as the king-elect chosen by the sacred lot.

18. But with regard to the first argument, we are constrained to admit its soundness in general, although we cannot accept it in detail. For there is nothing in ch. 8 to show that Israel was not at the time suffering from Philistine oppression, although this oppression is not mentioned explicitly as an argument in favour of the establishment of a monarchy. The events described in 7. 5-14 took place in Samuel's middle age, while ch. 8 is placed in his old age. In the years that intervened between ch. 7 and ch. 8, the Philistines must no doubt have avenged their defeat at Ebenezer, and re-established their suzerainty over Israel. The statement in 7. 13 can only have been true for a time. The writer of that passage could not have been ignorant of all the great struggle with the Philistines which lasted the whole reign of Saul and part of David's reign also. He must have heard, for example, of the invasion of Israelitish territory by the Philistines which

resulted in the death of Saul at Gilboa. And we have no right to accuse him of deliberate imposition. All that we can say is that he is guilty of an undue exaggeration, of want of precision, and of a certain looseness of expression, caused no doubt by his enthusiasm for the achievements of the religious revival led by Samuel. Thus, the writer of ch. 8 does not contradict the references to Philistine suzerainty contained in 9. 16; 10. 5; he only ignores them. Again, the statement in ch. 8 that there was a strong agitation among the people for the institution of the monarchy, and that this agitation forced Samuel to look out for a king, is not contradicted in 9-10. 16. On the contrary, as we have shown above (§§ 11, 13), this narrative knows of the agitation and assumes it in at least two passages (9. 20-21; 10. 15). Further, it is not correct to say, as some critics do, that the writer of 9-10. 16 displays friendliness towards the monarchy, as opposed to the hostility of 8; 10. 18 f.; 12. The writer is only interested in the person of Saul, but not in the institution which Saul represented. Sympathy with Saul as an individual was not lacking even in those who were opposed to him as king; cf. 15. 35.

19. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there are important differences between 9-10. 16 and the rest of our section, though we must not with the critics magnify these differences into actual contradictions. The differences between the two portions of our section extend to the vocabulary, the diction, the method of narration and of the presentation of facts, and to the general spirit and purpose of the two narratives. They each represent different points of view and emphasize different facts, though not actually contradicting or excluding each other. Hence

we are bound to conclude that they are the works of two different writers, of whom the author of 9-10. 16 was the earlier. But we must reject the 'redactional hypothesis', which asserts that the two narratives were pieced together by a redactor in the manner described above (§§ 1, 3, 4). For, as we have shown, the two narratives are not contradictory, but supplementary, and they are also incomplete by themselves. How, then, shall we explain the presence in our section of the work of two different writers? I propose to explain it by what we may term, for want of a better name, the *authorship hypothesis*. By this I mean that the whole of our section (chs. 8-12) was written as it lies before us by the *author* of our book; ch. 8; 10. 17-27; 11; 12 is his own original composition, while 9-10. 16 he borrowed from an older work which dealt with the story from a different point of view. That work, as we have indicated above, must also have given an account of the popular agitation for the appointment of a king, but our author did not find that account suitable for his purpose, and so he gave us his own account of it. He may also have derived ch. 11 from that source, but there is nothing very distinctive about that chapter, and I see no reason for denying it to our author. The huge numbers in 11. 8 and the separate mention of Judah favour the view that the author of the chapter lived a long time after the event he described. The passages marked by the critics as redactional additions (10. 25 b-27 a; 11. 12-14) are, as we have shown, essential for the development of the story; they are inseparable from their context and indistinguishable externally from the verses preceding and following them. We, therefore, have no hesitation whatever in assigning them to our author.

We now proceed to examine the second crucial section of our book, and there also we shall find that the 'redactional hypothesis' breaks down utterly, while our own 'authorship hypothesis' offers a reasonable and satisfactory solution to the problems presented by the composition of that section.

#### THE ADVENT OF DAVID.

20. The story of the introduction of David to Saul, contained in chs. 16-17, consists according to the analysis of the critics of a combination by a redactor of two independent and irreconcilable accounts, viz. 16. 14-23 and 17-18. 5. The first account is the direct continuation of 14. 52, and is the older and the historical one. It tells how Saul becomes a sufferer from some mental derangement, and how on the advice of his courtiers he seeks for a skilled musician to relieve his suffering. One of his attendants recommends to him a son of Jesse, whom he describes as a skilled musician, a brave and experienced warrior, a man of prudence and of a handsome appearance. David is then brought to the court and the king soon grows very fond of him, and makes him his armour-bearer. At the king's request of Jesse, David remains permanently attached to the king.

The second, which is the younger and the legendary account, relates how in one of the many wars between Israel and the Philistines a certain Philistine giant challenges the Israelitish host to produce a champion who would engage him in single combat, but none of the Israelites dares to accept the challenge. Then the shepherd lad David is sent by his father to visit his three elder brothers who are serving in the battlefield. The lad hears the

challenge and undertakes to engage the Philistine. The king offers him his armour, but the young lad does not know how to use it. Eventually he slays the Philistine with his sling and some pebbles which he carries in his shepherd's scrip. On his triumphant return with the Philistine's head in his hand, the king inquires for his name and family. He then takes the lad into his service, and Jonathan, who falls in love with him, secures his friendship by means of a solemn covenant.

This double account is introduced by an apocryphal story of the secret anointment of David by Samuel among his brothers (16. 1-13), a story which, the critics declare, is related to ch. 17, but written by a later hand.<sup>9</sup>

21. It will be seen that, as in the story of the election of Saul, so also in this section the alleged redactional process is very complicated. The redactor begins his story with 14. 52. After giving one single verse, which should have been followed by 16. 14, he suddenly breaks off and inserts ch. 15, then 16. 1-13, and only then resumes the thread of his original account, which began in 14. 52, by continuing with 16. 14-23. He then proceeds to insert in ch. 17 another independent account of David's coming to Saul, which contradicts and refutes the account just concluded. This is, indeed, a very strange proceeding, but we have already become accustomed to the vagaries of the critics' redactor, and need not be unduly surprised at his insertions, however long, or at his self-contradictions, however glaring. Nevertheless, we have a right to demand from the critics that at least each of the constituent documents which they obtain by this astonishing analysis

<sup>9</sup> Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, 247. His arguments and conclusions are, as usual, piously repeated by all his disciples and followers.



of theirs should be self-consistent, logical, and free from any discrepancies. But this, as we shall show, is not the case.

22. The first account given in 16. 14-23 begins according to the critics with 14. 52. It knows nothing of the rejection of Saul in ch. 15 or of the anointment of David in 16. 1-13. It is the continuation of chs. 13-14 which in their turn are the continuation of the source J in the story of Saul's election (§ 3).<sup>10</sup> But can 14. 52 really be the beginning of 16. 14-23? That verse tells us that on account of the fierceness of the struggle with the Philistines Saul attached to himself every brave warrior that he could discover. This, the critics say, is intended to introduce the story of Saul taking up David in 16. 14-23. But in 16. 14-23 we hear nothing of the Philistine war, and David is not brought to Saul as a likely champion against the Philistines, but only as a musician to soothe the king's troubled spirit. The statement in 14. 52 suits not 16. 14-23, but rather ch. 17, where David becomes attached to Saul through his heroism against the Philistines. As a matter of fact, there is absolutely no need whatever to wrench 14. 52 violently out of its present context and tack it on to some passage two chapters below. It is quite intelligible where it stands, for it refers back to the account of Saul's wars in 14. 46-8, and to the mention of Abner, Saul's chief of the host, in ver. 50 b (ver. 51 is parenthetical). 14. 52 has certainly no connexion whatever with 16. 14-23, and the critics will have to find another beginning for J's account of David's Coming to Saul, since 16. 14 is too abrupt to be considered the beginning of the account.

<sup>10</sup> Ch. 9-10. 16, 27 b-11. 11, 15. The story of Saul's rejection in 13. 8-14 is according to the critics an interpolation. We shall deal with this question later on.

Further, how is it that the writer of 16. 14-23, who, according to the critics, is ignorant of Saul's rejection, should fail to explain the cause of the king's strange affliction? The origin and cause of such a mysterious and calamitous event in the king's life must surely have been a subject of deep interest to the historian. Why does he not tell us anything about it?

23. The whole structure of the critics is based upon the assumption that there is a radical difference in the representation of David between chs. 17 and 16. 14-23. In ch. 17 David is a young shepherd lad ignorant of the use of weapons of war, while in 16. 14-23 he is a full-grown and experienced warrior. But this assumption is altogether incorrect. David bears the same character in both stories. He is expressly described in 16. 19 as being a young shepherd. And even if we allow the critics to delete the phrase **אִשֶּׁר בִּצְאָן**—though there is no other reason for rejecting the phrase, except that it contradicts the hypothesis of the critics—there still remains the fact that in ver. 19 as well as in ver. 22 David is described as being still in a state of tutelage to his father, a state quite unsuitable for a **גִּבּוֹר חֵיל וְאִישׁ מִלְחָמָה** (ver. 18). And after he has spent some time with the king, David is still considered unfit, presumably by reason of his youth, to occupy any other military position than that of armour-bearer to the king, a position equivalent to that of the squire of the mediaeval knight, and usually occupied by youths; cf. 14. 1, 6 (**הַנֶּעֱר נִשָּׂא בְלִיּוֹ**); 20. 35, 40; 31. 4 (**כִּי יָרָא מֵאֵד** proves him to have been a youth); II 18. 15. It is true that this representation is not quite consistent with the description of David given by the courtier in 16. 18, a description which forms the foundation and starting-point of the critics'

analysis. But the courtier's description must be taken *cum grano salis*. It was evidently that of a friend of David who was anxious to create in Saul's mind a highly favourable impression of the young musician. For this purpose he exaggerated David's accomplishments, knowing full well that the young hero would in a short time justify in full the eulogistic description of his friend.<sup>11</sup> For where did David prove himself a *נבון חיל ואיש מלחמה*? He could not have done it in some private war of his own. He must have engaged in the national wars carried on by Saul. If so, it is strange that in view of 14. 52 Saul or Abner should not have heard of him before. But, as stated, the whole description must be regarded as the flattering exaggeration of a friend. It is also possible that the description is anachronistic, i.e. written from the point of view of the narrator himself.<sup>12</sup> In any case, the description must not be taken in a literal sense, since, as we have shown, it is inconsistent with the representation of David in the rest of the passage. Thus the whole structure of the critics, which rests mainly on the literal interpretation of this verse, tumbles to the ground.

24. Where, then, are we to find the beginning of the account of David's coming to Saul? There, where all simple unbiassed readers have always found it, viz. in 16. 1. For the departure of the Lord's spirit from Saul is evidently

<sup>11</sup> The ancient Rabbis already interpreted the passage as an exaggeration; cf. Sanhedrin 93 b, and Rashi, *ad loc.* Some have proposed to delete the words *נבון חיל ואיש מלחמה*. But one must strongly deprecate the mutilation for our own convenience of an otherwise honest and intelligible text. Besides, *נבון חיל ואיש מלחמה* is obviously parallel to *ואיש תאר*, which is certainly genuine.

<sup>12</sup> We shall have occasion later on to point out many other cases of anachronisms in our book.

the consequence of the rushing of the Lord's spirit upon the newly anointed David (ver. 12).<sup>13</sup> The two parts of ch. 16 (vers. 1-13 and 14-23) are closely connected with each other, being both of one piece and by one hand. Only we must assume that some time had elapsed between the anointment of David and his coming to Saul's court, since in the second part he appears somewhat older than in the first part.

25. But the critics will object to this very obvious theory of the unity of ch. 16. They will tell us that the two parts of ch. 16 cannot belong to one and the same writer, because vers. 14-23 is good sober history, while vers. 1-13 is nothing but a legend, a mere 'Midrash'. It may, however, be asked, What right have the critics to credit the ancient writer with their own views of the comparative historicity of the two events, or with their own modern distinction between historical fact and historical legend? To the ancient writer the anointment of David by Samuel may have been as much a historical fact as the insanity of Saul and the minstrelsy of David. But I go further and assert that the story in vers. 1-13, however inaccurate in its details, may yet rest upon a basis of truth. There is no doubt that the estrangement between Saul and Samuel, and the rejection, if not the deposition, of the king by the prophet are historical facts. Equally a fact is the existence of a friendship between David and the prophetic and priestly party of which Samuel was the head. When David is forced to flee from Saul, he first of all seeks

<sup>13</sup> The 'Spirit of the Lord' is conceived as something quantitative which can be removed from one person and placed upon another; cf. Num. 11. 17, 25; 1 Kings 22. 24; 2 Kings 2. 9.

a refuge with Samuel (19. 18 ff.),<sup>14</sup> and next with the priests (21. 2 ff.). Ahimelek might have been quite honest in his assertion that he had not known that David was a fugitive. At the same time, he did not deny that friendly relations had for a long time existed between David and himself (22. 15). Had that not been the case, then even Saul, tyrant that he had now become, would not have dared to destroy the whole priestly clan on a mere trumpety charge of treason. Again, it is a significant fact pointing in the same direction, that as soon as David had formed his band we find among his followers a prophet in the person of Gad (22. 5). It is, therefore, quite probable that, at least after he had become a popular hero and a successful military leader, David had been designated by Samuel and his friends the future king of Israel. The fears inspired in Saul's mind by the ambition and the continually rising popularity of David, as compared with his own growing isolation (22. 8), which resulted from his breach with Samuel, were thus not altogether without foundation. This view is strongly confirmed by many passages in our book, cf. 23. 17; 24. 21; 25. 30; II 3. 9-10; 5. 2 b. Of course, the critics deny the historicity of all these passages. But this much they must admit, that already at a very early period, certainly not later than the beginning of David's reign, there was a general belief that David had been appointed by God to be Saul's successor. On the basis of this historical fact the story was built up in a later generation that some time after the breach between Samuel and Saul at Gilgal, the prophet at the bidding of God anointed David as king of Israel while still a boy in his

<sup>14</sup> We shall show later that the critics are wrong in regarding that incident as legendary.

father's house, and that the cause of Saul's well-known insanity was his desertion by the Spirit of the Lord, which had gone over to his rival. We are, therefore, quite justified in assuming that the author of 16. 14-23 reproduced this story in 16. 1-13, believing it to be just as true as the incident described by him in 16. 14-23.

26. The critics have another objection to the historicity of 16. 1-13, viz. the fear of Samuel lest Saul should hear of his mission to Bethlehem (ver. 2), a fear which ill becomes the powerful personality of ch. 15. But here the critics display a lack of consistency. They have been reiterating their theory that the representation of Samuel as a great personality, who ruled the people and made and unmade kings, is a later conception. The earlier and more correct representation they hold to have been that of a local and unimportant seer who had little or nothing to do with the great national questions of the day (cf. § 15, 16). This should agree admirably with the nervous and timid prophet of 16. 2, and the whole passage should on this ground have been assigned by the critics to the early and historical source of J. However, in reality there is no inconsistency between the conception of Samuel in chs. 8, 15 and that in 16. 2. The awe-inspiring prophet of ch. 15 was after all himself but human, and liable to the weaknesses of other mortals. It would be unnatural to expect him to maintain at all times the grand overpowering fearlessness which he displays in ch. 15, when under the influence of a mighty inspiration. That Saul would have been capable of laying hands on the prophet if caught in such a treasonable act as the anointment of David, and that Samuel's fear was not unfounded, is amply proved by Saul's sacrilegious murder of the priests some time later.

27. In their further attempts to pick holes in our passage, the critics ask how it is that Samuel so far forgets his fears of Saul as to speak openly of his mission to Jesse and his sons, and why the alleged sacrifice is never performed. The answer is that Samuel had to tell Jesse of his mission in order to get him to produce his sons; he had to acquaint Jesse's sons with the object of his visit, because, according to the story, the sons had to be examined one by one, so as to find out the one who was to be anointed. That no express mention is made of the performance of the sacrifice should occasion no surprise. The sacrifice was only a minor detail of the story, and the object of the narrator is only to tell of the anointment. He leaves it to the intelligence of his readers and to their faith in the probity of Samuel to assume that the sacrifice had been duly performed in the presence of the elders of the city.

Having now established the unity of ch. 16, we must next inquire into the relation of this chapter to ch. 17.

28. Now, it would be easy for us to overcome the great difficulty presented by the discrepancies between ch. 16 and ch. 17 by adopting for ch. 17 the text of LXX B, and, with many critics, declaring 17. 12-31; 55-18. 5 to be a later interpolation. By this means we should have removed all the contradictions between the two chapters, and we should be able to ascribe ch. 17 to the author of ch. 16, the more so as the two chapters have some points of contact, cf. 16. 11 with 17. 34; 16. 12 with 17. 42. But this solution, though easy and attractive, would not be an honest solution. We have no right to impugn the integrity of a text for the sole reason that it runs counter to our theories, or that it contradicts another text which we

prefer. Ch. 17 as it stands in MT is quite intelligible and self-consistent. The suspected passages fit admirably well in their present context, and we have no right to delete them simply because they do not fit in with our preconceived notions, or with some other, it may be quite unrelated, passage. Then, again, we should have to explain the *provenance* of these deleted passages, how they arose, and what purpose their interpolation was to serve. Further, we should have to explain how a late interpolator dared to invent a story so totally at variance with ch. 16; how he dared to put into the mouth of Eliab such contemptuous and reproachful language against David, whom he knew, according to 16. 1-13, to be 'the anointed of the Lord'. These passages, therefore, must be regarded as forming an integral part of the original text of ch. 17. How comes it, then, that the author of LXX B has not got them in his translation? Are we to assume with many critics that this Greek translator played the part of the higher critic, and deliberately omitted these passages because of their inconsistency with ch. 16? This can hardly be so. Such a procedure on the part of the translator would be in strong opposition to the simple honesty, the *naïveté*, the faithfulness to their Hebrew original, which, as we know, is the almost invariable characteristic of the authors of the LXX. Again, the omissions of LXX B in ch. 17 can in no wise be separated from the omissions of LXX B in ch. 18, since the latter chapter is part of the same section as ch. 17. The omissions in these two chapters must be treated together, and both must be assigned a common origin and a common cause. But since there can be no doubt whatever that the LXX B text in ch. 18 is the more original one, and that MT in that chapter arose through



a number of expansions and repetitions,<sup>15</sup> it follows that the Hebrew text of LXX B lacked also the suspected passages in ch. 17. How, then, are we to escape from this vicious circle? On the one hand, the disputed passages in ch. 17 are necessarily an integral part of the original text; on the other hand, LXX B really read a genuine text which did not contain these passages, as proved by their more original shorter text of ch. 18.

29. There is only one way out of the difficulty, and it is this: The author of ch. 16, who, as we shall show later, is the principal or the sole author of our book, did not find it convenient or desirable to describe in his own words David's great exploit against the Philistine champion, which was the origin of Saul's jealousy of David and of all its consequences. Adopting the same method as in the story of Saul's anointment by Samuel (9-10. 16, cf. § 19), he preferred to incorporate into his work an extract from an older document describing the incident, viz. ch. 17. It may be that the account of that older document was

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Driver's note *ad loc.* The only notable exception is Budde (*op. cit.*, 217 f.), who, reversing the process, argues that because, as he holds, the author of LXX B deliberately omitted the disputed passages in ch. 17, therefore he must also have deliberately abridged the text of ch. 18. But the LXX text of ch. 18 is obviously of too smooth and too logical a character to be the result of a translator's tampering and tinkering. Further, the omitted passages in ch. 17 consist mainly of large blocks of verses, and their removal is comparatively an easy process, though not one of which the authors of LXX were capable. But the omissions in ch. 18 include also some short sentences and phrases, and are scattered all over the chapter. Their deletion is therefore a hard and complicated process, which, it is quite certain, was beyond the powers of the naïve authors of the LXX. Moreover, while we can easily account for the omissions in ch. 17, it is difficult to see what principle could have guided the Greek expurgators in ch. 18. Why should they have omitted 18. 8b, 12b, 29b-30? It is much more reasonable to assume that these passages are scribal glosses and amplifications in the MT.

already too well known and too popular to be easily superseded by a new version. But that extract contained portions which flagrantly contradicted the author's own history in ch. 16. To overcome the difficulty, he omitted from his extract those portions which contained the contradictions, and which he considered to be contrary to historical truth, viz. 17. 12-31; 55-8. 5. A later scribe, however, who knew the source used by our author, thinking the text of the author's work to be a mutilation, inserted into the author's text the omitted passages. But noticing the discrepancy between these passages and ch. 16, the scribe added 17. 15 in order to minimize somewhat this discrepancy. It is possible that this verse was originally nothing more than a marginal gloss. As such we must undoubtedly consider 17. 50, which is partly explanatory of ver. 51. Hence arose the difference between the texts of LXX B and MT, both of which are in a sense original and genuine. LXX B used a copy derived direct from our author's original, but expurgated text, while MT is descended from a copy which had been 'corrected' and 'restored' by the later scribe. This hypothesis will on examination be found the most satisfactory solution of the problem. For in addition to the arguments given above, it may further be pointed out that whereas it is inconceivable that an author, or even an editor, could place side by side two documents exhibiting such glaring contradictions, it is quite possible that a copyist who had no responsibility whatever for either of the two accounts, and who had not fully thought out the subject, knowing that the account before him was but a mutilation of the original source, would have no hesitation in supplying the missing parts, and, as the contradictions were not of his own making,

would only make a half-hearted attempt to harmonize the two accounts.

30. But the critics may object to this hypothesis because it assumes that ch. 17 is older than 16. 14-23, and that it was incorporated into the book by such a sober historian as the author of that passage. For the critics have decreed that ch. 17 is nothing but a legend, since Goliath the Gittite was not slain by David when a youth, but almost a generation later by Elhanan of Bethlehem, one of David's heroes, as stated in 2 Sam. 21. 19. But if so, how is one to explain David's sudden leap into popularity and the jealousy of Saul? The critics answer that David did indeed perform some heroic deed, an account of which stood in the original form of our book, but that that story was deleted in favour of the late Goliath legend. But the critics fail to offer any shred of evidence for such a supposition. Had such a story existed, it would surely have left behind it some trace, however faint. Nay, we may be certain that it would have been preserved in full side by side with the Goliath story, as a sort of duplicate (cf. ch. 24 with ch. 26, &c.). On the other hand, the references to David's exploit in 19. 5; 21. 10; 22. 10 prove that ch. 17 is not a late legend. No; the story of ch. 17 is quite genuine and old. What is legendary and late in it is only the identification of the Philistine champion with Goliath.<sup>16</sup> The story did not originally give the champion's name, either because it had never been known in Israel, or because it had been forgotten in the time of the narrator. Therefore the narrator almost throughout the chapter speaks only of *הפלשתי* (twenty-seven times in all). So the champion is

<sup>16</sup> This identification is older than the Chronicler; cf. 1 Chron. 20. 5.

described also in 18. 6 and by Jonathan in 19. 5. A later hand, however, interpolated in the text, or wrote on the margin גלית שמו מנח (ver. 4), and similarly in ver. 23 (quite unnecessarily after ver. 4) גלית הפלשתי שמו מנח. These phrases bear on their face their spurious character. Had the original narrator identified the champion with Goliath, he would not have given his name in a parenthesis. He would have said in ver. 4: וישמו גלית מנח. He would not have repeated that parenthesis in ver. 23, but would have gone on throughout the chapter to speak of the champion as גלית or גלית הפלשתי, and not simply as הפלשתי. Similarly, we must treat the name גלית in 21. 10; 22. 10 as an interpolation.<sup>17</sup>

31. The study of this section of our book has thus led us to conclusions identical with those we reached in our study of the story of the Election of Saul, viz. that the whole section is the work of one author, who, however, incorporated into his own composition material from an older source. We have seen that in both these sections the 'redactional hypothesis' proves itself to be of a highly artificial, complicated, and hence very improbable character; further, that it fails to remove the real difficulties of the text, that it creates new difficulties of its own, and that the arguments on which it rests are based on a wrong interpretation of the text. The failure of the 'redactional hypothesis' in these two sections, upon which its whole strength is said to rest, must prove fatal to its

<sup>17</sup> After writing the above, I find that an identical solution of the difficulty is proposed by A. R. S. Kennedy in his commentary on Samuel in the *Century Bible*, p. 122.

validity in other parts of our book. On the other hand, the hypothesis put forward by the writer, that we have before us the composition not of a patchwork redactor, but of an author, who, while largely telling his stories in his own words, also utilized the work of his predecessors, will be found reasonable in itself, and also capable of solving satisfactorily most, if not all, of the problems presented by the book.

We shall now proceed to apply our 'authorship hypothesis' to the other portions of the book, and to discuss in detail those passages of which the integrity has been denied or questioned by modern criticism.

*(To be continued.)*